

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Application No. 10/560,034
Attorney Docket No. 053429

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the drawing sheet containing figures 4(A) and 4(B) with the attached replacement sheet.

Please replace the drawing sheet containing figures 5 and 6 with the attached replacement sheet.

Please replace the drawing sheet containing figures 7 and 8 with the attached replacement sheet.

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-14 are pending.

Support for new claims 6-14 may be found in Applicants' specification as originally filed,
for example:

Claim 6	pages 6 and 12;
Claim 7	page 10;
Claim 8	pages 8-9;
Claim 9	page 8;
Claim 10	page 8;
Claim 11	page 9;
Claim 12	page 8;
Claim 13	page 8; and
Claim 14	page 11.

I. The Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner requests that Figures 7 and 8 should be labeled as "Prior Art."

Figures 7 and 8 have been labeled "Prior Art" as requested. Additionally, Figures 4(B) and 5(B) have been labeled "Prior Art." See Applicants' specification, page 11, lines 17-22, and page 12, lines 10-17.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' drawings fully comply with 37 C.F.R. §§1.81, 1.83 and 1.84 and it is requested that the objection to the drawings be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II. The Art Rejections

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being clearly anticipated by Yuji (JP06-219762 (cited by Applicants in the IDS)).

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yuji in view of Wakayama et al (USP 5,836,229).

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yuji in view of Ishikawa (USP 6,832,439).

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not anticipated by or obvious over the disclosures of Yuji in view of the secondary references and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections in view of the following remarks.

Independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to incorporating the subject matter of claim 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that Yuji in view of Wakayama et al does not teach or render obvious a diamond wheel for forming a scribe line on a surface of a brittle material while rolling thereon, wherein the diamond wheel is provided with a blade having a V-section in an entire circumferential direction of a peripheral edge portion of the diamond wheel, diamond grains having 1000 to 8000 mesh are held to the blade by means of a bonding agent, and a pitch

between the diamond grains at a front end edge of the V-shaped blade in the circumferential direction is 2 to 20 μm .

Yuji aims to forming a scribe line on, for example, a specific glass having a large strength, which is different from the present invention aiming that a good-conditioned scribe line is formed to a brittle material. Therefore, an aim or object of the present invention to be achieved is itself different from that of Yuji. In addition, a diamond film disclosed in Yuji is a deposited flat film, which is quite different from the diamond grain of the present invention as clearly defined in the amended claim 1.

Furthermore, as to the teachings of Wakayama et al, a peripheral edge 13 is formed by an incision (cut-in operation) by a whetstone Z, and as shown in Fig. 3 of Wakayama, the shape of the peripheral edge 13 provides a trapezoidal protrusions 14 having flat front ends. According to such trapezoidal protrusions 14 having flat front ends, good biting to an object to be worked is not provided. Therefore, the glass scribing disc disclosed in Wakayama et al is not usable for a brittle material.

Even if the cited references are combined, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the inventive diamond wheel, in which a good-conditioned scribe line can be formed on a brittle material.

The above discussion focuses on the disclosures of Yuji and Wakayama et al in view of the rejection of the subject matter of claim 2. The other cited art, Ishikawa, does not overcome the deficiencies in the disclosures of Yuji and Wakayama et al discussed above.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Application No. 10/560,034
Attorney Docket No. 053429

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 1 and 3-14 is neither taught by nor made obvious from the disclosures of Yuji, Wakayama et al and Ishikawa et al, either alone or in combination, and it is requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.


III. Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is allowable and ask that the objection to the drawings and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited.

If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local exchange number listed below.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP


Lee C. Wright

Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,441
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

LCW/af